| RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION |
|-------------------------|
| REQUIREMENT |

Address to: Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

| Docket No. | AERX-076CIP |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Application No. | 10/649,376 |
| Confirmation No. | 4605 |
| Filing Date | August 26, 2003 |
| Examiner | Kim, Christopher S |
| Group Art Unit | 3752 |

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Election of Species Requirement dated April 3, 2007. The Examiner therein required election of one of the following species:

Species A, Figure 1; Species B, Figure 3; Species C, Figure 4; or

Species D, Figure 5.

The Applicants hereby elect Species B of Figure 3, with traverse.

The pending claims 1-26 are believed to encompass the embodiment of Figure 3.

The embodiments shown within Figures 1 and 4 are specific versions of the more general embodiment shown within Figure 3 where alpha is 0 and beta is 90°. Within Figure 2 phi is shown and within Figure 1 a special case of phi is shown where phi is 90°.

Figures 1 and 5 can also be compared. The angle theta shown in Figure 4 is 0 in Figure 5.

Applicants point out that although the flow of liquid in the creation of aerosolized particles is only shown within Figure 1 such a flow and the formation of particles could be shown within all of the Figures 2, 3, 4 and 5. Making a search for methods such as those encompassed by claim 1 as well as the other claims 2-26 would require searching in the same classes and subclasses. The particular embodiments within the different figures would not be embodiments which would be separated into different classes and subclasses and as such require separate searches.

Applicants have responded by electing Species B of Figure 3. It is applicants position

Atty Dkt. No.: AERX-076CIP

USSN: 10/649,376

that all of the claims 1-26 encompass Figure 3. To the extent the Examiner may require an additional election of specific claims applicants request the Examiner to focus attention on

claims 1-3.

As stated in the MPEP §803, if search and examination of an entire application can be

made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the entire application on the merits,

even though the entire application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is the

Applicants' position that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on all of the

claims together in the present application. Accordingly, the Applicants traverse the restriction

requirement.

The Applicants expressly reserve the right under 35 USC §121 to file a divisional

application directed to the non-elected subject matter or any subject matter disclosed in this

application during the pendency of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and

1.17 which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No.

50-0815, order number AERX-076CIP.

Respectfully submitted,

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

By:

Registration No. 28,807

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP 1900 University Avenue, Suite 200

East Palo Alto, California 94303

Telephone: (650) 327-3400 Facsimile: (650) 327-3231